



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/511,177	10/14/2004	George Braoudakis	MID-PT012	1955
3624 7590 11/24/2010				
VOLPE AND KOENIG, P.C.				
UNITED PLAZA				
30 SOUTH 17TH STREET				
PHILADELPHIA, PA 19103				
EXAMINER				
DEMEREE, CHRISTOPHER R				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3782				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
11/24/2010		ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

coffice@volpe-koenig.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/511,177

Applicant(s)

BRAOUDAKIS, GEORGE

Examiner

CHRISTOPHER DEMEREE

Art Unit

3782

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 September 2010.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 5, 6, 10, 11, 13, 23, 24, 26, 27, 31 and 32 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 5, 6, 10, 11, 13, 23, 24, 26, 27, 31 and 32 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 9/15/2010 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1, 5, 6, 10, 13, 23, 24, 26, 27 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Luberto (US 5725146 A) in view of Jones (US 2914235 A) or Campbell (US 2965279 A), and further in view of Yocum (US 6027018 A).

Regarding claims 1, 13, 23 and 24, Luberto teaches a container and blank for making including: a main panel (12) having a plurality of substantially straight edges about its periphery (14, 16, 18 and 20), each edge extending angularly from each of two adjoining edges (see Fig. 1); a plurality of side walls (32 and 46) depending from at least half of the edges of said main panel, said edges having side walls (see Fig. 4); a base panel (Luberto; 12) and a cover panel (Luberto; 105) one or more of said side

walls having an outer wall panel (41) and an inner wall panel (43), said outer wall panel extending from a proximal fold or score line (14) along a remaining edge and said inner wall panel extending from a distal fold or score line (42) remote from the proximal fold or score line and along an opposed edge of said outer wall panel (see Fig. 4). The combination of the inner and outer side panels form a roll over wall of double thickness. Examiner notes that the top panel defined between lines 92 and 94 (horizontally), and lines 96 and 132 (vertically) are substantially the same shape as the bottom panel. Luberto also teaches a container wherein tabs (Luberto; 52 and 54) or the like are provided on the lower surface or edge of the container (Luberto; see Fig. 2). Examiner considers these tabs to be capable of circulating air between the bottom of the container and the surface on which the container rests. Luberto lacks a removable portion from one of said sidewalls and opposing upper tabs for stacking stability.

Jones teaches stackable trays comprising lower stacking tabs (38) that are complimentary to upper tabs (46) when a plurality of trays are stacked together. Campbell also teaches a tray wherein complimentary upper and lower tabs are used to facilitate stacking (21 and 22). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to modify Luberto's tray to include an upper stacking tab as well as the lower tab in order further enhance the stacking characteristics of the container (Campbell; Col 1 lines 20-25).

Yocum teaches a carton with integral promotional material wherein one or more of the walls further include one or more removable outer portions (138) that reveal promotional information on an inner panel (see Figures 1-24). Yocum teaches providing

said removable portion(s) on a variety of differing containers and in a variety of locations. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of applicant's invention to provide the removable portion to any one of a finite number of six locations on Luberto's box that are capable of comprising a removable portion while still maintaining the integrity of the container (i.e. cover lid sides, cover lid front, base sides, or base front wall); and it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill to select the base side walls. The inclusion of such promotional features on the outer wall panel of Luberto's pizza box would make the box more attractive to the consumer (Yocum; Col 1 lines 25-29).

Regarding claim 5, Luberto, as modified above, teaches a container in which the removable portion (Yocum; 138) or portions are arranged with a perforation line (Yocum; 136) or line of weakness to facilitate removal from the remaining wall portion and inner wall panel and the remaining outer wall portion together with the inner wall panel, which is left intact after removal of the removable portion (as explained in the rejection of claims 1 and 4 above), retain sufficient structural integrity that the container remains stackable (Luberto; Col 4 lines 5-15) and performing its function in retaining the heat and/or freshness of its contents when enclosed therein.

Regarding claims 6 and 27, Luberto, as modified above, teaches a container wherein the removable portion includes a slit, or cut providing a tab (Yocum; 132) to facilitate easy removal of the coupon from the outer wall panel. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to further

modify Luberto's container to include a slit providing a tab on the removable coupon portion so that the removal of said coupon is more easily facilitated as taught by Yocum.

Regarding claims 10 and 31, Luberto, as modified above, teaches a container wherein the sidewalls are at equal angles to each adjoining sidewall (Luberto; Fig. 2 shows side wall meeting at right angles to one another) and the side walls have substantially parallel edges such that the main panels are close to a substantially parallel spaced apart disposition, there being three side walls which together with the joining panel (Luberto; 76) constitute a four-sided carton forming a square or rectangular prism and the side walls and joining panel have dimensions selected for the packaging of pizza style pies (Luberto; Fig. 1), and may include ventilation holes (Luberto; Col 2 lines 25-27), corner reinforcing tabs (Luberto; 68, 70, 80 and 82), simple single-paneled side walls (Luberto; 60) on the main panel not having the roll-over walls and such like as desired.

Regarding claim 26, Luberto, as modified above, teaches a container with double wall thickness (Luberto; inner wall panel 43 and outer wall panel 41) wherein only one panel has a removable section for a consumer coupon (Yocum; 138), leaving an intact inner wall panel and structurally sound box. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of applicant's invention to place said removable coupons on the outer side panel rather the inner side panel so that the promotional material would be viewable to the consumer (Yocum; Fig. 21).

4. Claims 11 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Luberto in view of Yocum as applied to claims 1 and 23 above, and further in view of Uffmann (US 6153280 A).

Regarding claims 11 and 32, Luberto, as modified above, teaches everything except a removable portion with magnetic material to permit the removable portion to be temporarily attached to a metallic surface. Uffmann, however, teaches a magnetic card with perforations (58) that allow the panel (54) to be attached to a metallic surface via magnet (56). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of applicant's invention to further modify Luberto's pizza box to include magnetic strips on the removable coupons so that the coupons could be placed on a refrigerator (Uffmann; Col 1 lines 14-17).

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments, see Pages 9-12, filed 9/15/2010, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1, 5, 6, 10, 13, 23-27 and 31 under USC 103(a)—in view of Luberto and Yocum have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of USC 103(a)—Luberto in view of (Campbell or Jones) and further in view of Yocum.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to CHRISTOPHER DEMEREE whose telephone number is (571)270-1982. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri, 8:00 AM-5:00PM, Alt Fri, EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nathan Newhouse can be reached on (571) 272-4544. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Christopher Demeree/
Examiner, Art Unit 3782

/Nathan J. Newhouse/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3782